UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,845	07/20/2001	A. John Speranza	PES-0042	8798

23462 7590 12/19/2003

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER	
SINES, BRIAN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1743	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/909,845	SPERANZA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian J. Sines	1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *29-42* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of group 1, claims 1 – 28 in the response submitted 11/14/2003 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 29 – 42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DiPierno Bosco *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,103,409 A). Regarding claims 1 – 12, DiPierno Bosco *et al.* teach a method and apparatus for monitoring and controlling the operation of proton exchange membrane fuel cells. DiPierno Bosco *et al.* teach an electrochemical fuel cell apparatus

comprising: an electrochemical cell (4); an energy source (26) configured for providing a quantity of energy to the electrochemical cell; a sensing apparatus (32); and a computer (42 & 48), wherein the computer further comprises: a memory device; and a processor (see col. 3, line 65 – col. 5, line 62; figure 1).



FIG. 1

These claims recite various functional limitations, such as how the processor regulates the operation of the electrochemical cell. In a claim drawn to an apparatus statutory class of invention, a functional limitation may not be divorced from any specifically recited structure or composition. A functional limitation is an attempt to define an apparatus by what it does, rather than by what it is, as evidenced by its specific structure (see MPEP § 2173.05(g)). Regarding product and apparatus claims, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (see MPEP § 2112.01). The Courts have held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.

See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). The Courts have held that apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishable from the prior art in terms of structure, not function. See *In re Danley*, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959); and *Hewlett-Packard Co. V. Bausch and Lomb, Inc.*, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (see MPEP § 2114).

Furthermore, these claims are replete with process or use limitations, which do not further delineate the structure of the claimed apparatus from that of the prior art. Since these claims are drawn to an apparatus statutory class of invention, it is the structural limitations of the apparatus, as recited in the claims, which are considered in determining the patentability of the apparatus itself. These recited process or use limitations are accorded no patentable weight to an apparatus. For example, these claims recite how the apparatus is to be operated, such as how the processor regulates the energy source in relation to the gas output, which do not impart any limitations to define the structure of the apparatus being claimed. Process limitations do not add patentablility to a structure, which is not distinguished from the prior art. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The Courts have held that it is well settled that the recitation of a new intended use, for an old product, does not make a claim to that old product patentable. See *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The Courts have held that the manner of operating an apparatus does not differentiate an apparatus claim from the prior art, if the prior art

apparatus teaches all of the structural limitations of the claim. See *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (BPAI 1987) (see MPEP § 2114).

Regarding claims 13 – 28, as discussed above, DiPierno Bosco *et al.* teach all of the structure of the apparatus provided in the claimed method, which merely recites the conventional operation of that apparatus. Regarding process or method claims, a prior art device anticipates a claimed process, if the device carries out the process during normal operation (see MPEP § 2112.02). The Courts have held that when a prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed that the device will inherently perform the claimed process. See *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986). DiPierno Bosco *et al.* teach that the sensor (12) measures a parameter (*i.e.*, pressure) in the supply manifold (24) and sends a signal (40) to data acquisition unit (42). The sensor (34) measures the pressure in the exhaust manifold (30) and sends a signal (44) to the data acquisition unit (42). Similarly, the sensor (36) measures the pressure in the hydrogen supply manifold (26) and sends a signal (44) to the data acquisition unit (42) while sensor (38) measures the pressure in the hydrogen exhaust manifold (28) and sends a signal (39) to the data acquisition unit (42). The microprocessor (48) calculates the pressure differences between the supply and exhaust manifolds, then compares these pressure drops in the stack being monitored to reference pressure drops taken at the same current flow levels and stored in a reference library (50), which contain predetermined operating pressure values. If the pressure differential of the stack being monitored exceeds the predetermined threshold value (*i.e.*, a predetermined variance) at a particular stack discharge rate, the microprocessor (48) sends a signal (52) to a system controller (54), which alerts the stack operator, and/or automatically initiates any of several

possible alternatives to correct the flooding problem (see col. 4, line 47 – col. 5, line 62). DiPierno Bosco *et al.* teach that the microprocessor (48), which comprises a read-only-memory device, communicates with the data acquisition unit (42) and the system controller (54) by means of an appropriate communication network protocol (see col. 5, lines 38 – 62).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Meltser *et al.* teach a fuel cell monitoring system. Nguyen teaches a fuel cell system and method of operating the system, wherein reactant fluids are supplied and purged. Pratt *et al.* teach a method and apparatus for managing fuel cell performance. Clingerman *et al.* teach a venting method and pressure sensing and vent-valving arrangement for monitoring an anode bypass valve for a fuel cell system. Edlund *et al.* teach a system and method of controlling the operation of a fuel cell system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Sines, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0401. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (11:30 AM - 8 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700